DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 428 439 EA 029 697

AUTHOR Levey, Joyce C.; Acker-Hocevar, Michele
TITLE Site-Based Management: Retrospective Understandings and Future Directions.
PUB DATE 1998-11-00
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (27th, New Orleans, LA, November 4-6, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Decentralization; Decision Making; Educational Administration; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *School Based Management; School Organization; School Restructuring; *Strategic Planning

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a retrospective view of how a school district implemented Site-Based Management (SBM). A pilot study examined the historical development of the site-based decision-making process so as to gain a better understanding of how a large urban school district implemented the process and to assess teachers' understanding of their roles and the processes of SBM. The report focuses on one school system's movement to decentralized decision making and the system's efforts in writing a policy for the implementation of SBM so as to learn what students, parents, and faculty saw as the priorities in making site-based decisions and to assess the faculty's knowledge of the shared decision-making structure, as well as their experiences. The paper provides a definition of site-based management and gives a historical perspective of decision-making structures in schools. Using surveys and focus groups, it was revealed that evaluation of the implementation of SBM does exist but there is no accountability in place. Furthermore, the strategic-planning process, although meeting constituents' concerns, does not have a plan of action to address survey priorities as part of the goal process for planning. (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 428 439

Running head: SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT: RETROSPECTIVE UNDERSTANDING

Site-Based Management: Retrospective Understandings and Future Directions

Joyce C. Levey

Doctoral Student, The University of Alabama

joyce.c.levey@bama.ua.edu

Michele Acker-Hocevar

Assistant Professor, The University of Alabama

Administration and Educational Leadership

macker@bamaed.ua.edu

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Levey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Paper presented at the Mid-South Educational Regional Conference (MSERA)

New Orleans, Louisiana: November 1998

EA 029697

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Site-based management (SBM) changes relationships and shifts the authority for decision-making from the central office to the local school site. Initially, a new superintendent encouraged an urban district to decentralize decision-making authority. In May 1995 the school board supported the initiation of school-based councils.

This paper presents a retrospective view of how a district implemented SBM. The purposes of this pilot study were to conduct a historical review of the implementation of the site-based decision making process; to gain a better understanding of how one school was making sense of how to implement the process through an analysis of critical areas of need identified by parents, faculty, and students; and to assess teachers' current understanding of their roles and the processes of SBM.

Site-based management (SBM) requires a set of complex skills built over time by different role groups such as teachers, parents, and administrators. The effects of SBM purport to change relationships and shift authority for decision-making from the central office to the local school site. SBM is viewed by many scholars as a component of restructuring schools and is reported to have several advantages. First, higher levels of commitment, effort, and morale are likely to result from collaborative participation in decision-making (Fowler, 1996; Murphy and Beck, 1993; Richard, 1996). Second, decisions are supposed to improve if they are made by the persons with the greatest knowledge about the school, its students, and its programs (Stribling, 1992).

Improving student instruction is a goal of site based management (Sheane and Bierlein, 1992). Simon (1957) identified three reasons for adopting a school-based management approach: cost effectiveness, time effectiveness and motivation. Mintzberg (1983) states that upper management does not have the appropriate information needed to make decisions because they are too far removed from the problems. He also concludes that decisions made at the school level are more responsive to the conditions requiring the decision and more likely to result in addressing programmatic changes. Thus, employees tend to feel a sense of ownership and pride when they are involved in a substantial manner in the decision-making process at the local level.

This study is about one school system's movement to decentralized decision making. In May of 1995, an urban school board supported a new superintendent's initiative for adopting site based management councils at each school level. The superintendent argued that there was a need to change current policies, procedures and programs that reflected different contexts and encouraged more community involvement at the local sites. These changes should occur at the local site instead of the central office because of each school's unique context.

This retrospective study is to (a) describe one school system's efforts in writing a policy for the implementation of SBM, (b) to gain insight into what students, parents, and faculty saw as priorities for goals in one school to be used to make site-based decisions,

and (c) to assess a faculty's knowledge of the shared decision making structure and their experiences.

Definitions of Site-Based Management

Site-based management is defined differently by various scholars, but usually includes these three components. First, there is a delegation of authority to individual schools to make decisions about the educational program of the school. This can include personnel, finance and/or budget, and curriculum. Second, there is an adoption of a shared decision making model at the school level by a management team that should include the principal, teachers, parents, community members, and sometimes students. Third, there is facilitative leadership at the school level to ensure follow-through of decisions (Murphy, 1991, Hodder, 1994).

Lindquist and Mauriel (1989) suggest it is important to review various definitions and note "fundamental features" (p.404) that bridge these definitions. One of the important features to all SBM definitions is the act of delegating (Lindquist & Mauriel, 1989). Garms, Guthrie, and Pierce (1978) stipulate that SBM is the sharing of the decision-making power from the central office to the local school. The principals should have the control over the management operation at their sites with follow-through decision-making power (Dondero, 1993, Neal, 1988). Marburger (1985) expands the base of decision making power to include " the principal, teachers, parents and citizens and the students themselves" (p.11). Harvey (1991) points out, "There is neither clarity nor agreement on its [school-based management] definition" (p. 1). For the purpose of this retrospective study, school-based management will be defined as any transfer of decision-making to the local school.

Historical Perspectives of Decision Making Structures in Schools

Before 1920 principals controlled schools at their local sites. After 1920 principals' roles shifted; they no longer made decisions at the local school sites, but implemented decisions made by the superintendent and the local boards, adopting a corporate model for decision making. This philosophical position for decision making was borrowed from industry, changing schools to "people factories" (Callahan, 1962).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Cubberly (1929) said, "Our schools are, in a sense, factories in which the raw products (children) are to be shaped and fashioned into products to meet the various demands of life" (p. 325). Centralized decision making operations were studied and tested in businesses over the past 100 years (Roberts, 1993) and are rooted firmly in an industrial model of the factory, which measures productivity using efficiency standards. The principal was the foreman and the teachers were the workers to be controlled. As the structure of school governance evolved, centralized decision-making authority was the accepted norm of operation for schools.

From 1920-1960 schools became more isolated from communities as centralized control expanded (Lindelow & Heynderickyx, 1989). In 1964 the Elementary and Secondary Education Acts (ESEA), sought to legitimize parents and community involvement in educational practices and decision making (Spear, 1983). In the 1970s educators and policymakers became more concerned about the adoption of the behavioral theory paradigm. This paradigm focused on the evaluation of public schools with performance indicators such as the ranking of schools by standardized test scores (Elmore, 1990) and providing parents and policy makers with comparative data about how schools were performing. Since the 1970s, there has been united effort to assess standardized test scores and school effectiveness (Bailey, 1991).

The first national movement to assess tests scores and effective schools resulted from A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform (National Commission of Excellence in Education, 1983). This document encouraged each state to increase product measurements and requirements within schools. These mandates included increased graduation requirements, intensified teacher evaluations, and increased teacher certification requirements (Elmore, 1990; Lewis, 1989; Wagstaff & Reves, 1993). This first movement was disappointing because it did not change the outcomes of public education (Wagstaff & Reves, 1993). The reason for this failure was that the increase in efficiency measures did not address the culture of work in schools.

The second movement arose from research on changes recommended for teachers and principals (Roberts, 1993). Again, educators turned to business models to correct

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

educational problems. These reports came from the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a profession and the Education Commission of the States. The reports concluded the reform mandates were taking decision-making authority away from teachers and principals with little improvements in test scores and other standardized measures. Steps were taken to address collaborative efforts of administrators, teachers, school board members, superintendents, parents, and business and community leaders to improve schools (Futrell, 1989; Murphy, 1991; Nardina & Antes, 1991).

Educators turned to Deming's Total Quality Management as the modified business model to build collaborative and participatory cultures. The Deming philosophy model was implemented successfully in numerous schools across the U.S. Many of Deming's "14 Points" reflect the philosophy of current school-based management. His model of decision-making gave authority to stakeholders and accountability to participants. Deming knew that top leadership had to lead the change. Thus, he encouraged senior leadership to support employee involvement. This was a first step in moving towards more democratic principles of shared governance.

President Bush and the nation's governors initiated six fundamental and national goals at an education summit in September 1989. In the resulting America 2000 initiative the governors reached consensus on the need to decentralize school systems (Wohlsetta, 1990). "Communities can become an America 2000 Community and achieve the National Educational Goals in a variety of ways, but all plans must use community members" (America 2000, 1991, p. 1). The plan recommended 10 steps that a community might use such as convening a local coordinating group that represents the composition of the community and developing a plan to involve the entire community. Communities were encouraged to celebrate their successes and share their stories.

Lindelow and Heynderickx (as cited in Young,1996) focus on power issues for SBM. They contend:

> In many districts, the administration of education has been decentralized to the point of diminishing returns, say critics. A new balance of decentralization and

> centralization – autonomy and control – need to be struck. By reassigning a good deal of decision-making authority to the school site, school-based management can redress the current overemphasis on centralization and control. (Lindelow and Heyndrickx, 1989,p.109-110).

Marburger (1985) maintains, "Schools should respond directly to parents' demands" (p. 20). Parents have a right to demand accountability; their children should receive the benefits of education. Marburger states parents have a right, as well as a responsibility, to be actively participating in their child's educational process. If parents hold school personnel responsible, then, these school personnel, Marburger argues, need to be involved in school operations for which they are accountable.

Method

The method for this study is a retrospective analysis of the implementation of the site-based management process through (a) reviewing the school board policy, (b) survey results from parents, faculty, and students, and (c) the knowledge the faculty had of SBM, with a follow-up focus group of new teachers to the system.

The site chosen for this study was a large urban school district. The district has a diverse citizenry, which is reflected in its culture. The diverse population of this city helps to ensure the success of innovative programs. The economic base is diversified, ranging from international industry to retail stores to service occupations to professional occupations. As a result, the population ranges from very affluent to very poor. All of these economic levels have an impact on schools. The location of the industrial plants as well as the number of non-native students and teachers in the higher education institutions has contributed an international flavor to a relatively small city. This benefits the local schools in many ways. The multicultural population seems to demand power sharing as a prerequisite to effective planning and delivery.

The varied population of the urban district is reflected in the diversity of the student populations at its thirteen elementary schools, three middle schools, one high school and six secondary alternative programs. The total number of students (pre-K through 12) enrolled in the district is 10,103 with an average district per pupil

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

expenditure of $7,247.51. The goal for each school is to focus on the educational progress of students' outcomes rather than the learning processes (Winter, 1997).

The culture of the local urban site in the study reflects racial diversity. Student enrollment is approximately 1400, comprising all academic levels except the very lowest achievers, who attend a specially designed school elsewhere in the system. There are 91 faculty members, one principal, two assistant principals, and a dean of students. The student body is 61.5% African American, 37.1% White and 1.4% Asian or Pacific Islander. Forty-two percent (42%) of these students qualify for free/reduced price lunch. Classes range from special education (8.6%) to gifted social studies classes. The wide variety of courses provides that students have the opportunities to succeed at developmentally appropriate levels in all subject areas.

Questions

The questions that guided this study were: (1) What was the board policy and how was it implemented? (2) What were the most important goals identified by three distinct groups of faculty, parents, and students? (3) What information/knowledge did the faculty have as to their roles and the rationale for SBM?

The first data source is the board's policy for implementation of SBM. The policy was delivered to the school community through system-wide staff development inservices and workshops. The second data source is the school-wide surveys administered by the local school council. The council was comprised of teachers, community leaders, parents and students. The council's purpose was to facilitate the transfer of decision-making to the school level (Linquist and Mauriel, 1989). The survey assessed the understanding of the role of teachers in SBM regarding accountability, as well as concerns and possible solutions to better inform the faculty about site-based decisions. The third data source was a follow-up focus group. The purpose of the group was to assess the faculty's perceptions of the site-based decision-making (SBDM) council. Finally, a focus group session, which was an informal exchange and dialogue between the new teachers to the system and facilitators, addressed results of the faculty survey.

Results

Question One

The first question in the study examined the board policy for implementing SBM councils at each school. The policy is stated below:

I. Charge from the Board (3/20/95):

A. The Board of Education believes that schools operate best when there is a close cooperation among parents, teachers, and administration and when the decision making process is closest to the point of implementation except for district issues. A strong partnership is formed between the school and the community leading to the formulation of communal education values and a firm commitment to practices, which will instill these values in our children.

B. A Site Based Management Committee, which abides by Board policy and state and federal regulations, stays within prescribed budget limits, and promote ethical practices, would be a tremendous asset to the City Schools and would make a significant contribution to the operation of our school.

C. For these reasons, the Board of Education directs that Site Based Management Committee be formed in each building following the procedures presented herein.

D. It is understood that recommendations from the Site Based Management Committees, which require Board action, are recommendations only, with final determination to be made by the Board.

II. School Site Based Management Committee

Each school in the City School District will create a School Site Based Management Committee. The purpose of this committee is to provide a cooperative means of improving educational programs and conditions within the school. The committee will meet a minimum of every other month, and minutes of all meetings will be maintained, distributed at the local school and circulated to all schools and to the facilitating committee. The committee will operate within

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the guidelines of Board of Education budget, and the Board of Education's standard of ethics. All committees will operate under the rule of one vote for each member (with the exception of the open committee position who will not have a vote). The majority opinion, providing a quorum is present, will become the committee recommendation.

III. Make-up of Committees

On the elementary, middle and secondary levels each committee will be composed as follows:

A. Two (2) community representatives

B. Four (4) parents (at least one (1) from PTA)

C. Four (4) teacher representatives

D. One (1) support employee representative

E. One (1) principal

F. One (1) open committee position*

G. One (1) student (at the middle and secondary levels only)

*A position to be temporarily filled based upon issues to be considered by the committee

IV Selection of Committee Members

A. Parents on the committee will include the president of the PTA or the designee and three (3) additional members to be selected by lottery from interested parent volunteers to fairly represent grade levels.

B. The teacher members will be elected by the majority of the staff members in school they represent.

C. The support staff member will be elected by the majority of the support staff in the members they represent.

D. Community members will be selected by the committee from a list of

E. Volunteers compiled by the committee.

F. The student representative will be the Student Council President or designee

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

G. The open committee position will be invited by the rest of the committee as need arises.

H. Committee members may serve for a period of up to two (2) consecutive years. One half of the committee will be replaced each year except for the principal who remains a permanent member.

I. Each site council will democratically elect a chairperson and secretary.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

V. Parameters of

Decision Making	Administrative/Board	Site Council
District goals and objectives	Formulated by the administration and the board. Adopted by the Board of Education.	Informal input by local site council.
Individual school goals and objectives	Copy sent to Board for informational purposes.	Recommendations made by the local site council-copy sent to central office for review and approval by Superintendent.
Personnel	Initial screening and reference checks accomplished by central office administration. Superintendent will submit a recommendation to the Board for consideration.	Local site council representatives will be involved in the interview process for those positions relative to that site, and make recommendations for those positions.
Finances	Superintendent will submit recommendation to the Board for consideration.	Requests made by local site council for funds needed for program improvement projects will be submitted to the Superintendent.

VI Facilitating Committee

A. Facilitating Committee will be formed to monitor the implementation of the decision making process formulated at the school site, and to initiate necessary waivers. Additionally, this committee will articulate district-wide concerns, which may develop. This committee will meet a minimum of twice a year, and a quorum must be present for decisions to be made.

B. Facilitating Committee will be made up of the following:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. The Chairman of the Board of Education or the designee.
2. The Superintendent of Schools or the designee;
3. The President of the City Schools PTA or the designee;
4. Two (2) building principals appointed by the Superintendent (One (1) elementary, one (1) secondary);
5. Two (2) teachers (one (1) elementary, one (1) secondary), to be appointed by the President of PET.
6. Two (2) parents to be appointed by the President of the Urban City Schools PTA
7. An open chair to be filled by the rest of the committee as deemed necessary
8. The President of PET or the designee.
9. The President of ESPO or the designee.

The second part of question one asked how the Board implemented SBM. To understand how the school system implemented the Board Policy, it was necessary to go back and review all SBM staff development components provided to administrators and site councils. From reading all the staff development materials kept at the district office the following areas of SBM implementation were identified for successful implementation: role descriptions, control development, accountability, degree of autonomy, degree of duration, and the degree of effectiveness.

"Role descriptions" only encompassed a title for each member of the site council. "Control development" identified areas of expertise and how members of the council could use their expertise in the decision making process. The principal was, however, to "control" the follow-through of decisions to ensure the work was completed. "Accountability" was associated with how the principal held school members to be responsible for action or activities to address decisions made by the councils. There was also another level of accountability, which included documentation of minutes from the councils to ensure schools were adhering to board policy. "Autonomy" referred to the freedom given local sites to address unique issues at their schools. The "degree of duration" addressed the decision making process associated with program continuance.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and persistence, while "degree of effectiveness" was related to the decisions associated with the extent to which a program or innovation satisfies the condition for which it was implemented that is, its effects on clients, school members, and learning.

It is important to note that the district held orientations and training sessions for new SBM council members and retraining sessions for present members to discuss their duties and responsibilities. Members were provided with new knowledge and provided tools to improve communication between site-based councils and school communities. The school site councils were expected to submit their school minutes to the central office, which would synthesize and organize all the minutes from each school to look for strengths and weaknesses they could address in future training.

Question Two

The second question in the study addresses important goals, determined by the Site Based Management Council's (SBC) survey, for the school to achieve. This survey is part of a continual process towards school improvement. The SBM council at the local site administered the school-wide survey. The survey was administered in 1996 to determine the five most important goals for the school to achieve. Faculty, parents and students answered the survey.

Two years ago the SBC conducted its survey of all students, parents, and faculty members at the site. The survey results were tabulated and prioritized to identify the main areas of concern. These became the goals for the school community. The first survey conducted in 1995 contained fourteen items constructed by the SBC from areas of concerns and/or needs of the school. In 1997-1998 two items were added to the original survey from the previous year's survey suggestions, goals, and comment section.

The top five goals from the surveys administered in 1997-98, identified by combining response to the survey from parents, students, and faculty were to (a) eliminate gang activity, (b) upgrade technology, (c) equip each classroom with correct sized desks, (d) alleviate overcrowding to improve facilities, and (e) improve test scores.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The faculty, students and parents at the local site displayed different perceptions of what they saw as legitimate goals for their school. The faculty and students both included similar individual items not necessarily ranked in the same order of importance. The faculty ranked at the top of their list to "eliminate overcrowding," whereas the students ranked it at the bottom of their priorities. Parents did not identify overcrowding as a problem. Parents were most concerned with safety, student achievement, and improving instruction. Students did not list student achievement or instruction in their classrooms as a priority (see Table 1). Parents and students both identified school safety or "eliminate gang activity" as a main goal.

The faculty's concerns were centered on facility improvements to increase classroom instruction and student achievement. In contrast, the parents were concerned about the effects of teaching as it related to student outcomes such as improving test scores, upgrading technology, and improving instruction. All the groups in the survey agreed there was considerable work to be done with the site-based council to improve the student learning environments and their achievement levels.

The faculty perceived "alleviate overcrowding through improved facilities," as the most important item whereas the students perceived to "equip each classroom with correct sized desk and chairs" as the most important item. Both these items are in contrast to what parents saw as most important, "eliminate gang activity."

The items that ranked lowest in the responses from the faculty and students are the exact opposite of what each group saw as important. The faculty gave the lowest ranking to "equip each classroom with correct sized desks," while students ranked "alleviate overcrowding through improved facilities" as their lowest in importance. In contrast parents ranked to "improve student discipline," as least important.

The combined rank ordering from the faculty, students, and parents has safety as their top priority for schools to "eliminate gang activity" at the high school. The lowest combined rank ordering is to "improve student scores on standardized tests." The faculty, students and parents ranked safety first and academic achievement as the last concern.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1

Rank Order of Priorities Identified by Faculty, Students, and Parents by number of Respondents for the Item in Relation to Total Responses

Faculty	Students	Parents
1. Alleviate overcrowding through improved facilities (30/30)	1 Equip each classroom with correct sized desks (413/413)	1. Eliminate gang activity (122/122)
2 Improve student discipline (26/30)	2. Eliminate gang activity (394/413)	2. Improve test scores (116/122)
3. Work to increase school pride and sense of belongingness (23/30)	3. Upgrade technology (371/413)	3. Upgrade technology (101/122)
4. Eliminate gang activity (19/30)	4. Improve school's image (327/413)	4. Provide classroom instruction in critical thinking and goal setting skills (85/122)
5. Equip each classroom with correct sized desks (17/30)	5. Alleviate overcrowding through improved facilities (319/413)	5. Improve student discipline (70/122)

Question Three

The third question in the study concentrates on the responses of the faculty focus group to the questions concerning knowledge and information of their local (SBM) council. The purpose of the group was to discuss findings of the survey. The survey was a memorandum requesting feedback and volunteers to discuss information about SBM. The intent was to make SBM effective at the local site. The questions queried the faculty on the mechanics and dynamics of the SBM council, their awareness levels, and their comfort-zones concerning the implementation and maintenance of SBM to date.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

There was a 15 percent response from the faculty to the survey. The faculty stated that there was apathy on their part in responding to the survey due to lack of support from the district and local school level administrators. The focus faculty group also stated they had not been responsible or felt accountable to the SBM council.

The informal exchange between the faculty and facilitators analyzed data gathered from the survey. The topics included the role of teacher accountability, as well as addressed the concerns and possible solutions to better inform the faculty about site-based decision-making. Faculty comments from the survey ranged from defining the SBM council as a professional obligation, with the potential for positive change', to a council with frustrated members who felt powerless to make any recommendations or changes to the actual day-to-day operation of the school. The focus group confirmed the goals of the SBM council, to increase student learning, as being important, but felt as teachers they were not validated by the group. They also felt powerless to effect change.

Discussion

The archives support that the urban district has made more than a reasonable effort to implement SBM in the system and local school sites. This district has consistently been innovative in its programs. And, when viewed within the larger context of Alabama's traditional and hierarchical educational structures, SBM is taking a radical approach to school governance. Within the district, all the schools expressed a desire for decision-making to be made at the local level focusing on education improvement. Therefore, a policy was developed and a council was selected at each site. The first agenda for each new council was to develop consensus-building techniques. The district is still dedicated to this end.

Local school administrators and all interested faculty attended the SBM staff development workshops. These attendees then met at their local school site to organize their SBM councils. Once the councils were organized, they implemented a staff development process to address individualized school action plans. In reviewing the district data on site councils, 80 percent of the schools had a functioning SBMC in place. Although all schools stated they had the structure in place, all were not functioning

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Although SBM from this urban system is innovative and progressive, the policy cites legal parameters that included local, state and federal regulations (Neal, 1988, p. 4), and defines the make-up and membership of the local SBM committees (Marburger, 1985, p. 11), there was no clear definition of the roles and relationships to the faculty and their local sites. Further, there was no mention of the critical components or competencies necessary to understand, implement, and maintain SBM by administrators, teachers, and the communities.

One of the components of SBM is to identify the various constituents' views. The school council at the local site administered school-wide surveys. The council comprised of teachers, community leaders, parents and students sought to build a common and collaborative culture to solve problems through identifying priorities to address across the surveys (e g. Deming, Kaufman). Stribling (1992) stated that "School-based management is based upon the belief that individual schools have unique needs, which can best be identified and met by those closest to the needs: parents, teachers and students" (p. 54).

The responses in the focus group indicated faculty at the local secondary site felt uninformed about site-based decision-making (SBM). They also had concerns in regard to how their views and recommendations were incorporated into school improvements. The faculty focus group members felt powerless in that many of their suggestions were never implemented and they did have any recourse to see those administrators followed-up on the committee's actions.

Conclusion and Recommendations

All three data sources validate that site-based management (SBM) was a component of the restructuring process in our school system. The focus was on decentralizing decision-making from the central office to the local school level. Results from the three sources looked at a retrospective understanding of SBM policy and implementation.

Overall conclusions from the study are:

- The district held workshops to facilitate the implementation of SBM as well as the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

criteria that would be implemented at local schools.

- The evaluation/assessment of the implementation and establishment of SBM is present, but suggests that there was no accountability model in place.
- The school site does not consistently address survey responses.
- Central office failed to synthesize the minutes from the schools and assess the efforts of the councils.
- The strategic planning process is addressing constituents' concerns, but does not have a plan of action to address survey priorities as part of the goal process for planning.
- The decision-making processes were reviewed, but were not integrated to date into the local school's strategic plan.

Evaluations of any new program or concept at the system level or at the local school level should include a collaborative means for evaluation. This would allow the system to see where they are with the development, implementation, and establishment of SBM. The system could determine future directions based on a retrospective understanding of the SBM policies in place and their actual implementation. Recommendation to the school district include more staff development on SBM that address the following areas.

1. Leadership roles as they pertain to SBM. This would include the principal, faculty, parents, community members and students that form the council. The focus of the program should isolate components and competencies necessary to understand, implement, and maintain SBM.
2. Teacher roles as they pertain to SBM. This would include a definition, boundaries, responsibilities, accountability, and chain of command within the council as to duties, roles, and how work is carried out and completed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. Adjustment periods for implementation and establishment of SBM. This would include studying research literature, identifying comfort zones, improving communication skills, how to reduce tension in the group, and anticipate obstacles.
4. Support and resources available for implementing SBM. This would include review of historical archives, action plans, strategic plans, and methodology for evaluations and school board policies that are integrated.
5. How to analyze assessment data and survey materials as they pertain to SBM. Councils need to know how to survey data to find out what the responses to the surveys meant and how to address the identified problems; councils could then conduct formative and summative evaluations to gauge the extent of improvements underway.
6. School governance. A notebook for each site should be developed that would include a definition, additional research on SBM, comparison studies of the individual schools in the district and comparison studies from other school systems.

School-based management is a multidimensional innovation, which takes an entire school system working in concert to ensure the maximum opportunity for success (Young, 1996). The system and its constituents are instrumental in successful implementation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REFERENCES

Bailey, W. J. (1991). School-site management applied. Lancaster, Pennsylvania: Technomic.

Callahan, R. E. (1962). Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Cubberly, E. P. (1929). Public school administration. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Dondero, G.M. (1993). School-based management teachers' decisional participation levels, school effectiveness, and job satisfaction. (Doctoral dissertation, Fordham University) Dissertation Abstracts International, 54(05) AAC 9328408.

Elmore, R. (1990). Introduction: On changing the structure of public schools. In R.Elmore & Associates (Eds). Restructuring Schools: The next generation of education reforms (pp 1-29). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Fowler, D. C. (1996). The relationship of shared decision-making on teacher morale: Implications for middle school administrators. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Alabama, 1996). Dissertation Abstracts International, 57 (06), AAC 9634000.

Futrell, M. H. (1989). Mission not accomplished: Education reform in retrospective. Phi Delta Kappan, 71 (1) 8-14.

Garmes, W.I. Guthrie, J.W. & Pierce, L.C. (1978). School finance: The economic and politics of public education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Harvey, E. (1991). Reaching new heights: A guide to the implementation of school-based decision-making under the Kentucky Education Reform Act. Kentucky School Boards Association: Frankfort.

Hodder, R. J. (1994). The balance of power: a study of attitudes and perceptions related to the establishment of school councils. (Masters of Education dissertation, Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada, 1994) Dissertation Abstracts International, 33 (06), AAC MM 96047.

Kubick, K. (1988). School-based management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 020 559).

Lewis, J., Jr. (1989). Implementing school-based management by empowering teachers. Westbury, CT: J.L. Wilkerson Publishing Co.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Lindelow, J., & Heynderickx, J. (1989). School-based management. In S. C. Smith, & P. K. Piele, School leadership: Handbook for excellence (2nd ed.). Eugene: McGraw-Hill.

Lindquist, K. M., & Mauriel, J. J. (1989). School-based management: Doomed to failure? Education and Urban Society, 21 (4), 403-416.

Marburger, C. L. (1985). One school at a time. School-based management: A process for change. Columbia, MD. National Committee for Citizens in Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 263 683).

Meyers, D. & Stonehill, R. (January 1993). School-based management. Education research consumer guide. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 353 688).

Mintzberg, H. (1983). The structuring of organizations: A synthesis of the research. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Murphy, J. (1991). Restructuring schools capturing and assessing the phenomena. New York: Teachers College Press.

Murphy, J. & Beck, L. G. (1995). School-based management as school reform. Taking stock. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Nardini, M. L. & Antes, R. L. (1991). The right reforms. American School Board Journal, 178 (4), 17-19.

National commission of excellence in education. (1983). A nation at risk. The imperative for education reform. Washington: Government printing office.

Neal, R. G. (1988). School-based management. An advanced model. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Negotiations and Contract Administrators, San Francisco, CA.

Richard, R. J. (1996). Perceptions of the participation level of teachers in the shared decision-making process of Cobb County, Georgia. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Alabama, 1996).

Roberts, R. R. (1993). An analysis of state school reform legislation and related litigation. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida, 1993). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54 (07) AAC 9333085.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sheane, K. & Bierlein, L. (October 1992). Barriers to school restructuring Arizona State University: Temple Morrison Institute for Public Policy. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 359 663 EA 025 113).

Simon, H. (1957). Administrative behavior (2nd ed.). New York: Free Press.

Spear J. P. (April 1983). School site budgeting/management: The state of the art. Paper presented at the annual meting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, No. ED231 082).

Stribling, D. M. (1992). Initiation of school-based management in a new Texas elementary school: Process and product. (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A & M University, 1993). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54 (01), AAC 9315023.

Wagstaff, L. H. & Reyes, P. (1993, August). School site-based management Report presented to the Education Economic Policy Center. Austin: University of Texas, College of Education.

Winter, R. A. (1997). Tuscaloosa City School System, Superintendent Interviews.

Wohlstetter, P. (1990). Experimenting with decentralization: The politics of change. University of Southern California. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 337 861).

Young, R. A. (1996). A comparative study of the relationship between selected characteristics of board members in Georgia and their attitudes toward selected areas of decision-making in school-based management (local board of education) (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Alabama, 1996). Dissertation Abstracts International, 57 (06) AAC 9366970.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE